

Subject: Fwd: Westchester CDO
From: Donald Duckworth <duckworth.donald@gmail.com>
Date: 03/14/2012 09:17 AM
To: Craig Weber <craig.weber@lacity.org>

This will add to your understanding of the current discussion in Westchester.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Donald Duckworth** <duckworth.donald@gmail.com>
Date: Wed, Feb 29, 2012 at 11:08 AM
Subject: Re: Westchester CDO
To: Andy Loos <Andy@hbdrollinger.com>
Cc: JRUhlen916@aol.com, Matthew Hayden <haydenplanning@ca.rr.com>

I think this is a very thoughtful email Andy. We should spend some serious time with these thoughts and provide some leadership for achieving our highest / best potential. I'll make sure this is on the next WTC BID meeting agenda.

The way I read the CDO, is that the creation of new parking through redevelopment on the east side of Sepulveda would not "impedexisting shared parking facilities or lots."

The way to fix all of this may be to creat WTC urban desig guidelines that obviate the need for the CDO. I beleive that has been done in some areas of LA. The CDO is the "poor area's substitute" it seems and we may be paying the price for taking that path.

Thank you Andy.

On Mon, Feb 27, 2012 at 11:38 AM, Andy Loos <Andy@hbdrollinger.com> wrote:

John & Don: In reviewing the Westchester CDO I noticed on page 11 Standard 2g it states, "No new project, change of use or building modification shall result in the reconfiguration, separation, division, walling, fencing or otherwise impede existing shared parking facilities and lots". So with the parking association on the East side of Sepulveda it appears that no redevelopment can occur on those parcels. So this area will remain as surface parking forever. Was this the intent? It seems to me there is no way to increase the supply of parking so redevelopment of the current buildings will be tough.

In my opinion Westchester has a unique problem. Sepulveda is the main thoroughfare for our retail district. And we want it to be attractive, pedestrian

friendly etc. But the retailers along Sepulveda don't consider Sepulveda as their primary entrance and access. The access is on the alley which is where the parking is located. So on one hand we want Sepulveda to be a pedestrian friendly boulevard but we don't give the pedestrians a good way to get there.

If we look at Carusso's projects we see that his developments turn their backs to the primary access streets- much like Bed-Bath & Beyond did. They do a better job with landscaping and architectural design than BB&B did but the concept is the same. If you look at the Carusso Center in the Marina the Lincoln Blvd frontage is inaccessible. All of the retail's front doors are facing the surface parking lot and the pedestrian experience is between the parking lot and the stores- not on the main arterial of Lincoln.

The Grove is the same thing. All of the retail stores front on a central courtyard accessed by the parking garage- no pedestrian access from the main arterial streets.

I have seen developments where the parking is in the back but pedestrian pathways are set up to draw the patrons to the front of the buildings. Of course this would be an issue for us because we have so many property owners and none of them would be interested in giving up their land for pedestrian walk-ways to connect the parking lots to Sepulveda.

What can we do? What is feasible? What would get support from all of the land owners?

I don't think we can convince the retailers to force their customers to access their stores from Sepulveda. So, Sepulveda will really be a façade of retail openings and architecture – sort of the “false front”. But can we make the back more pedestrian friendly and attractive? Right now we have an alley with no connections between the properties. Could we create a sidewalk or walking path between the properties?

In a round-about way I'm relating this to the CDO. The current CDO has some problems. Can it be amended?

I think Matt is going to come back to the BID with some ideas and that will be interesting.

Lisa brought up the idea that design review board decisions are subject to appeal. I don't know if that is true or if CDO decisions are subject to appeal. If Design Review is subject to appeal I want to determine how that process works.

Andy

H.B. Drollinger Co.
8929 S. Sepulveda Blvd. #130
Los Angeles, CA 90045
Tel: [310-417-8048](tel:310-417-8048)
Fax: [310-417-8029](tel:310-417-8029)
Cell: [206-200-0675](tel:206-200-0675)
andy@hbdrollinger.com